1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
6	AT SEATTLE	
7	SOLUTIONS ARCHITECTS LLC,	
8	Plaintiff,	
9	v.	C20-1802 TSZ
10	NORSTAN COMMUNICATIONS INC.,	MINUTE ORDER
11	Defendant.	
12	The following Minute Order is made by direction of the Court, the Honorable	
13	Thomas S. Zilly, United States District Judge:	
14	(1) Plaintiff Solutions Architects LLC's motion for partial summary judgment, docket no. 12, is DENIED. The Court notes that Plaintiff has not pleaded any claim for a	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20	method by which a party may exercise its right to allow the Agreement to naturally expire; moreover, a party may only terminate the Agreement "for cause," which is	
21	narrowly defined in the Agreement as (1) "any breach of the terms of this Agreement" or (2) "the commission of any crime," neither of which is present here. See Agreement,	
22	Ex. A to Jarrett Decl. (docket no. 12-1 at 12). This language tends to support Plaintiff's interpretation that Defendant might owe commissions to Plaintiff under the Agreement,	
23	either because the Agreement never naturally expired on November 9, 2020, or because	

MINUTE ORDER - 1

Defendant improperly terminated the Agreement without cause. On the other hand, Article B of the Agreement expressly states that "no commission will be due or owing from [Defendant] to [Plaintiff] after the date of termination or expiration," indicating that the parties contemplated the scenario in which the Agreement could expire, absent a party's for-cause termination, and despite the auto-renewal clause. *Id.* (emphasis added). This language tends to support Defendant's interpretation that it properly allowed the Agreement to expire on November 9, 2020, by providing Plaintiff with 30 days' notice, meaning Defendant does not owe any commissions to Plaintiff after that date. The Court concludes that there are genuine issues of fact on whether the Agreement expired or was terminated and if so, whether and to what extent commissions would be due under the Agreement. That is, the circumstances surrounding the making of the contract, and the subsequent acts and conduct of the parties, is "necessary to assist the [C]ourt in interpreting words and applying them to the actual events in order to ascertain and implement the intention of the parties." Berg v. Hudesman, 115 Wn.2d 657, 671, 801 P.2d 222 (1990). 8 (2) Defendant's motion to strike, docket no. 15 at 3–4, certain statements in the declaration of Brandon Jarrett, docket no. 12-1, and Exhibits B and D attached thereto, is STRICKEN as moot. 10 Defendant's motion for partial summary judgment, docket no. 15, on (3) 11 Plaintiff's claims for breach of contract, breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, quantum meruit, and unjust enrichment is DENIED, as the contract language at issue is ambiguous, and genuine disputes of material fact otherwise preclude summary 12 judgment. The unopposed motion for summary judgment, docket no. 15, on the "suit on 13 account" claim is GRANTED, and the claim is DISMISSED with prejudice. See Pl.'s Response (docket no. 19 at 15). 14 The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Minute Order to all counsel of **(4)** record. 15 Dated this 15th day of July, 2021. 16 17 Ravi Subramanian Clerk 18 s/Gail Glass 19 Deputy Clerk 20 21 22

23